DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 681 CS 503 867

AUTHOR Rolls, Judith A.
TITLE Assessment Strategies for Student Interpersonal Communication Journals: A Comparison.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Canadian Speech Association Conference (Toronto, Canada, August 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Holistic Evaluation; *Speech Communication; *Writing Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Analytic Scoring; *Primary Trait Scoring; Student Journals

ABSTRACT

A phenomenological approach was used in a study of three assessment strategies for the evaluation of journals written by speech communication students: (1) analytic assessment strategy; (2) primary trait assessment strategy; and (3) holistic assessment strategy. Completed question-and-answer packets, consisting of 8 to 12 diaries each, written by 30 randomly chosen students in an introductory speech communication course were qualitatively evaluated in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral areas. In the analytical assessment strategy, the journals were scored according to a checklist of individual traits. The primary trait strategy focused on a specific characteristic, self-disclosure. The holistic strategy rated the overall impression of the document. Although the analytic and holistic approaches produced similar results, the analytic approach was superior because it was most efficient to implement, it tapped criteria considered important by other journal raters, and it covered a broad range of traits. The primary trait approach was the most difficult to use, and the holistic approach, although easiest to implement, provided no guidelines for the rater. Although the results of this study may be of limited applicability, it would seem that the analytic approach with an element of self-disclosure added could be used to great advantage by trained raters. (Appendixes include forms used for each approach.) (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2186681

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Assessment Strategies for Student Interpersonal Communication Journals: A Comparison

by

Judith A. Rolls

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith A. Rolls

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Canadian Speech Association Conference
Toronto, Ontario
August, 1981

CS503867

Assessment Strategies for Student Interpersonal Communication Journals: A Comparison

INTRODUCTION

While communication journals are highly regarded pedagogical tools for interpersonal speech courses, little information is available regarding the assessment of such journals. In this study, three assessment strategies were examined in order to determine which provided the most useful information for a teacher regarding a student's mastery of Speech Communication in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains. The strategies included an analytic approach, a primary trait approach, and a holistic approach.

NEED AND RATIONALE

The journal is a useful teaching aid for a number of reasons. It helps students become aware of the relationship between experiences in the classroom, communication lab, home, etc., and the theories and concepts discussed in course texts, thus bridging the gap between academic and non-academic settings. As each student works on his/her own unique goals, the journal can provide the individual with a 'custom made' learning experience. It also supplies the student with an assessment tool for experiential learning by helping the individual to evaluate the learning that has taken

place. Thus the journal helps the student to put his experiences into perspective.

Along with the advantages of exploring cognitive and behavioral domains in the journal, Daly points out that students, "learn to examine the affective domain, one which is often neglected". [1] Journal writing can force the student to examine his feelings about himself and his experiences. Consequently, the journal may provide a wealth of information about a person's experiences and feelings of which the person may not have been aware. DeWine suggests, "Thus, the journal provides positive reinforcement of learned behaviors while at the same time allowing the student to develop more self-awareness." [2]

Journals also provide the opportunity for a personalized relationship with that one other person who will read the journal. A number of the proponents of the communication journal such as Phelps, DeWine, and Moore suggest that the confidential nature tends to enhance student/teacher relationships. Regular assessment of the journals by the instructor allows an insight into the student he/she may not normally achieve during regular classroom interaction. Sainty, a school counsellor who had students keep journals, found that more students expressed their problems when they knew someone was taking the time to read the journals. [3]

Baron discusses the effects of journal keeping on self-evaluation and self-actualization. He found a positive correlation between the two. [4] Fulwiner generalizes to other disciplines when he claims, "Journals can be vehicles to combat passive learning and to facilitate personal engagement, regardless of subject matter." [5]

However, one of the main problems in using student journals is the assessment of these journals. An initial library search of the literature provided almost no information in this area. A computer search of ERIC (Educational Resources Information Centre) combining such reference descriptors as diaries, student journals, classroom journal, communication diaries, assessment, evaluation, measurement, college students, community college student, higher education, etc. produced only thirty-one citations and only three dealt specifically with the Speech Communication journal. While the computer search did not produce a wealth of knowledge, it served to verify the conclusions of the researcher, that very little work has been done in the area of journal assessment.

Another area explored for assessment information was instructor's manuals. While some instructor's manuals readily suggested journal usage, most also suggested that teachers choose their own methods of evaluation. For example, Phelps and DeWine make the following recommendation: "At the end of the term we have the students turn in the entire journals so that the instructor can provide the student with an overall evaluation of the journal. Each instructor will need to choose the procedure which is most practical for him or her." [6] Weaver also suggests the use of journals but again does not provide an evaluation tool: "Periodically journals can be collected and graded (or responded to in some manner) by the instructor." [7] The instructions of both teacher's manuals would surely leave the inexperienced communication teacher in a state of quandry.

Only two instructor's manuals were located that contained information regarding the process of journal keeping. John Keltner's Instructor's

Manual for Interpersonal Speech Communication - Elements and Structures offers suggestions as to what factors "have shown themselves to be of value to students in keeping a record of communication activities."[8] While Keltner does not feel that journals should be graded, he does provide a checklist "of items which will give the student some idea of the teacher's perception of the usefulness of the journal."[9] (See Appendix A for checklist.)

The second instructor's manual that provided some assessment information was prepared by Moore for the text Introduction to Human Communication by James C. McCroshey and Lawrence R. Wheeless. Like Keltner, Moore doesn't believe that journals should be graded. However, he includes a checklist to "check the degree to which the student is making effective use of the journal and to provide appropriate feedback".[10](See Appendix B for checklist.)

These two manuals were helpful in that they provide the instructor with some concrete objectives to look for in a journal. The manuals accompanying some commonly used Interpersonal texts were also examined, the authors of which are: Stewart L. Tubbs and Sylvia Moss, 1974, 1976; William D. Brooks and Philip Emmert, 1976; Dennis R. Smith and L. Keith Williamson, 1977; Joseph A. DeVito, 1978; Bobby R. Patton and Kim Giffin, 1974; Gerald M. Phillips and Nancy J. Metzger, 1975; and John Stewart and Gary D'Angelo, 1980. Only Brooks and Emmert discussed journal keeping.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies From Related Disciplines

Many references referred to journal keeping for other disciplines, notably English and Literature courses, and included such titles as:

(1) "Student Journals and Literary Responses at the Community College Level," (2) "The Listening Journal: An Instructional Strategy for a Listening Awareness Program," (3) "The Student's Sociological Diary," (4) "Writing Journals in Courses," (5) Journal Writing Across the Curriculum," (6) "Discovering the Journal," etc. But most of these offered no specific criteria for assessment.

Robert Esch, who teaches an English Literature class uses the journal as an approach to teaching. Students are required to write once a week and there are no length/form specifications. Esch makes comments on the journals concerning shallowness, perceptiveness, or directions on how students might improve the journal. He presents a handout to the students which states:

> I shall judge your journal for its freshness and originality. I shall look for perceptive reactions, stimulating insights about literature, and a growing awareness of nineteenth and twentieth-century literature. [11]

The work of Daly, "Using Student Journals to Individualize Instruction," [12] is perhaps the most helpful. She offers some sound advice on journal evaluation. She feels that evaluating should consist of regular and prompt written and oral feedback. She suggests that readers should keep judgmental comments to a minimum and that instructors should pose questions where possible: "Questions, rather than statements tend to stimulate the continual growth of the student's perception of reality, critical thinking, and analysis of situations and self." [13] She proposes that students should answer the questions posed by the instructor and this should be supplemented with an oral meeting. She also recommends that inaccurate factual data should always be corrected by the instructor.

Along with giving some guidance for journal rating, she suggests criteria that formal evaluation should include:

- regular entries in the journal
- separation of observations and reactions
- in-depth analysis of observations
- objective perceptions of reality
- effective communication of ideas
- reactions based on knowledge and rationality as well as individual emotional responses
- justification of reactions
- formation of valid conclusions based on data
- separation of significant events from trivia
- focal points for practicum where maintained
- objective self-analysis

Two other people who have done work in the area of journal assessment are Permaul and Miko. [14] They suggest five broad categories or criteria for journal analysis. These categories are (a) self-awareness, (b) awareness of others and the environment, (c) skill development, (d) academic and cognitive development and (e) career understanding. They "analyzed the logs for methods to characterize the degree of understanding and competence students showed about the activities they recorded." [15] From this they devised three levels of competence to register the degree of understanding and competence revealed about a given experience. These are: (a) the ability to describe, (b) the ability to analyze, synthesize and generalize

and (c) the ability to take action or make a decision on a future course of action.

While the previous authors do not refer specifically to Speech Communication journals, the information is quite applicable.

Studies from Speech Communication

One person who has contributed much to the area of journal keeping is DeWine. However, she has not tackled the grading problem. Rather she suggests that, "It is best, however, not to evaluate or grade questions that call for a student's reflections on her or his own communication behavior or feelings about communication situations, or personal observations and responses to questions requiring self-disclosure." [16] She provides no empirical support or rational reasons for this assertion.

With Phelps, DeWine has also prepared a textbook, Interpersonal Communication Journal (1976). The book consists of numerous classroom exercises and games, each to be accompanied by a specific journal entry. Again, the instructor's manual does not provide any practical assessment guide to evaluate these journal entries. The authors pronounce, "There are several ways an instructor might want to handle the evaluation of the journal," but they do not suggest any specific evaluation modes. Rather they propose,

> Questions calling specifically for the relating of theories to class activities are easily evaluated according to the degree of theoretical understanding exhibited. It is probably best for the instructor to merely comment on questions dealing with personal observations or self-disclosure and not evaluate. [17]

While this philosophy may be well-grounded, it does nothing to assist the instructor who may want to evaluate a student's understanding of his affective or behavioral domain. Nor do they state why "personal observation" and "self-disclosure" should not be evaluated. Is it because such assessment is not pedagogically reliable or valid, or because it may harm the student?

DeWine suggests, "While there is strong theoretical support for the combined effect of experience based activities and student journals on behavioral change, experimental testing of exactly what changes take place needs to be conducted." [18] It appears that the pre-requisite for such research would be solid data on useful ways to assess these journals. Perhaps if the appropriate assessment tools were available, the task of testing the effect of journal keeping would be much easier.

One of the disadvantages of journal keeping reported by authors such as DeWine and Henerson, et al. is that journals require considerable time for reading and interpretation. However, if the instructor had a systematic approach to assessment, this problem might be reduced. As Daly purports, "A great deal of effort is demanded from the student and the faculty member, but the quantity and quality of learning tends to indicate that the journals generate a higher return for the investment."[19] Therefore, this thesis investigates the assessment of journals and determines what assessment strategies are the most useful in understanding a student's mastery of communication according to the cognitive, affective, behavioral objectives of a course in Interpersonal Speech Communication?

For the purposes of this study, a student journal is defined as "a diary-like record written by each student in the class, reflecting his/her

attitudes, feelings, and the expansion of his/her cognitive learning as the course progresses."[20] In this study the affective and behavioral learnings are examined as well. The assessment strategies refer to three evaluative approaches: an analytic approach, a primary trait approach, and a holistic approach.

Understanding a student mastery of communication is an indication to the instructor of the level or depth at which the student exhibits his/her knowledge of the cognitive, affective, behavioral objectives of the course. Cognitive objectives refer to the study and examination of introductory Interpersonal Speech Communication texts prescribed for the course.

A course in Interpersonal Speech Communication refers to an introductory course (SC 100) at the College of Cape Breton (Sydney, NS) lasting eight months, meeting for three hours a week class time and one hour a week lab time. The objectives of this course, as per the course description, are as follows: (1) to help students discover, experience, test, develop and accept their own uniqueness and that of others; (2) to raise the awareness of students concerning the omnipresence, complexity and power of communication in day-to-day living; (3) to help students analyze the distinct but interrelated elements and functions common to the process of interpersonal speech communication; and (4) to provide students with the opportunity of practicing and improving their Speech Communication skills, according to goals they select for themselves.

METHODOLOGY

Phenomenological Perspective

A phenomenological approach was adopted for this study as the literature lacked a guiding paradigm from which to work. Phenomenology describes the process of knowing. Bruyn explains it this way.

> Originally, the distinctive feature of the phenomenological movement lay in its claim to seek knowledge directly through immediate intuitive apprehension of human experience, free from the impurities of scientific conceptualization. This method of seeking original knowledge involves the "bracketing" of perception, as Edmund Husserl would put it, or the "reduction" of concepts to a point where the observer can contain a pure apprehension of reality. [21]

Thus, Bruyn is saying that subjective experiential learning or knowing is considered valuable. Bogdan and Taylor support this notion when they say, "When we reduce people to statistical aggregates, we lose sight of the subjective nature of human behavior."[22] From this perspective a conceptual framework must be established before beginning to test hypotheses empirically. As Bruyn argues, "Husserl and succeeding phenomenologists would say that, technically speaking, phenomenology preceeds empiricism (or underlies it) as a methodology, ..." [23] Phenomenology is the basis on which other learning can take place.

Qualitative Research Methods

The research methodology employed in this study utilized qualitative rather than quantitative data. Qualitative methods refer to "research procedures which produce descriptive data; people's own written or spoken words and observable behavior." [24] The two main approaches to qualitative

methodology are participant observation and personal documents. This study examined personal documents -- student communication journals.

Subjects in the Study

The data consisted of completed question-and-answer diaries of thirty randomly chosen students. Each student completed eight to twelve diaries and the total number (8 - 12) of individual diaries completed by a student is referred to a a "packet". Therefore, thirty packets of journals were examined, using each of the three assessment strategies.

Material in the Study

Diaries consisted of questions and answers in three sections: the cognitive, the affective and the behavioral. The cognitive section asked students to recall those concepts and theories examined and to identify those they understood and those which confused them. Later in the year the cognitive section asked them to identify classroom or lab activities that had been particularly helpful to them personally. The affective section examined the students' feelings about their communication behavior. A specific example would be, "What have you learned about the role of feelings in speech communication." Finally, the behavioral section dealt with the student's self report of communication strengths, weaknesses, and goals in each of the vocal, visual, and verbal areas.

The Assessment Strategies

The three evaluating procedures were rooted in theoretical perspectives developed for scoring writing samples in English composition classes and then adapted to suit the needs of communication journal assessment. While the literature suggested five procedures for scoring writing samples,[25] only the analytical, the primary trait and the holistic were chosen as these procedures are systematic approaches. Moreover, each distinctively differs from the other, but together they seem to intuitively cover the diversity of approaches used by teachers in assessments. Finally, they seemed readily adaptable to communication journals.

Analytical Assessment Strategy (AAS)

Analytical scoring involves isolating one or more characteristics and scoring them individually. Having to check a list of traits permits a reasonably comprehensive analysis of the work; this is one of the great advantages of such an approach.[26] For this study the AAS consisted of a guide or checklist adapted from Keltner's Instructor's Manual for the text Interpersonal Speech Communication--Elements and Structure[27] and Moore's Instructor's Manual accompanying McCroskey and Wheeless' Introduction to Human Communication.[28]

Part I examined four elements of the journal: (1) completeness of descriptions, (2) depth of entries, (3) indication of ability to apply communication principles and concepts and (4) specific areas in which work is needed. Part II of the AAS involved rating the student's knowledge of

speech communication in the cognitive, affective and behavioral areas as either clearly favorable, clearly unfavorable or somewhere in between. Part III of the AAS was completed when all the diaries in the packet had been individually assessed. Part III requested the evaluator to make some general comments about the packet as a whole.

Each diary in each of the thirty packets was evaluated using this approach. An assessment guide was developed to make the evaluation process easier. (See Appendic C). One assessment guide was used per packet.

Primary Trait Assessment Strategy (PTAS)

In describing the PTAS, Spandel and Stiggins say:

> Primary trait scoring is similar to analytical scoring in that it focusses on a specific characteristic (or characteristics) of a given piece of writing. However, while analytical scoring attempts to isolate those characteristics important to any piece of writing in any situation, primary trait analysis is rhetorically and situationally specific. [29]

The specific characteristic assessed in the primary trait approach was self-disclosure. Wheeless and Grotz describe self-disclosure as, "Any message about the self that a person communicates to another. Consequently any message or message unit may potentially vary in degree of self-disclosure present depending upon the perception of the message by those-involved."[30]

Self-disclosure was chosen as the basis for the PTAS because it was felt by the author to be the "primary" trait in Speech Communication. Self-disclosure is central to the development of the student as a communicator and, conversely, the competent communicator is one who self-discloses. "Various writers have identified individuals' ability and willingness to

self-disclose as determinants of their personal health and satisfaction, success in being understood and working competently with others, and ability to provide communication experiences which others find satisfying and therapeutic." [31]

Part I of the PTAS consisted of a checklist of topic areas adapted from a list by John Keltner,[32] with the addition of biographic and demographic topic areas. The instructor was to indicate the topic area disclosed as well as the degree of disclosure. The degree of self-disclosure was estimated by referring to a five point scale with 5 representing Very High disclosure and 1 representing Very Low disclosure. Part II consisted of indicating if the student's mastery of Speech Communication, as far as it affected their self-disclosure, was either clearly favorable, clearly unfavorable or somewhere in beween for each of the cognitive, affective and behavioral components.

An assessment guide was developed to aid scoring. (See Appendix D). One guide was used per packet. When the packet was completed, the researcher completed Part III by making some general comments.

Holistic Assessment Strategy (HAS)

Assessment Strategy Number Three takes a holistic approach to evaluation. By examining the information in a diary holistically, the instructor can become aware of the essence of the information; for often the "whole" is more than the sum of its parts -- it determines the nature of its parts. "Holistic scoring involves reviewing a paper for an overall or 'whole' impression." [33]

In Part I of the holistic assessment strategy, each diary is read and assessed individually for an overall impression. The impression of the student's mastery of each of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components is indicated as clearly favorable, clearly unfavorable, or somewhere in between. When all the diaries in the packet have been assessed individually using this strategy, Part II consists of making some comments concerning the content of the packet as a whole. (See Appendix E for Assessment Guide).

Procedures

Each diary in each of the thirty packets was evaluated using each of the three assessment strategies. While it was originally intended to apply the analytic approach first, the researcher, after experiencing the procedure during the validation process, decided to use the PTAS first as it was most useful for familiarizing oneself. Then, each diary in each of the 30 packets was re-evaluated using the analytic approach. Finally, each diary in each packet was read for a third time and reassessed using the holistic approach.

By applying each of the three assessment strategies to over 300 individual diaries, the researcher was able to phenomenologically gain knowledge about the usefulness of each of the three strategies for assessment.

Validation of Assessments

The researcher was validated for the specific task involved by having three communication experts (two of which held Ph.D.'s in the field while the third was a Ph.D. candidate in Social Psychology) evaluate three

randomly chosen diary packets. By arriving at similar conclusions as the primary researcher, some evidence would exist for the validity of conclusions subsequently drawn by the major researcher.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation of Each Strategy

Having assessed the data using each of the three assessment strategies, no one strategy emerged as outstanding in determining a student's understanding of Speech Communication. However, of the three strategies used in the study, the Analytic Approach was the superior for a number of reasons: (1) It was the most efficient to implement; (2) It tapped those criteria considered to be important by others who discuss journal rating; (3) The criteria covered a broad range so that it was possible to grade one aspect of the journal positively and other aspects negatively. However, it was felt that this strategy overlooked the presence of self-disclosure, the addition of which would have provided a more complete examination of the journal.

The Primary Trait Assessment Strategy was the most difficult to employ as it was very time consuming to isolate all the disclosure comments found in the journals into the various topic areas. Further, there was confusion as to what topic area a statement should be included under. This indicates that self-disclosure topic areas should be more clearly defined for the rater. Also, the topic area did not readily adapt to the data. While the cognitive section of the journal was being assessed for self-disclosure, there was little found due to the nature of the questions posed in this area of the

diary. There was also a problem trying to determine the degree of self-disclosure.

In general it was felt that the PTAS was not efficient in determining a student's master of speech communication as it focused on only one trait in the diary. However, as a strategy it was useful for uncovering and categorizing self-disclosure and it is suggested that the strategy may adapt more readily to an open style of journal.

The Holistic Approach was technically the easiest to implement, but its usefulness as an assessment strategy is quite limited as it provides no guidelines for the rater. While the approach is capable of producing a comprehensive general picture of a student's work, it is not recommended for inexperienced raters.

Comparisons Among Assessment Strategies

One of the findings of this study was that the AAS and the HAS generally produced the same results. One explanation may be that while the AAS applies a formal analytic system, perhaps the HAS implicitely and informally takes the same analytic system into consideration. The PTAS may produce different results as it examines only self-disclosure.

When using the AAS and the HAS, a direct positive relationship seemed to exist between the assessment of the diaries and the amount of writing. There may be three explanations for these results. First, the prolific writer provides more information, thereby enabling the instructor to obtain a clearer understanding of the student's feelings. Second, it may be that prolific writers offer more depth, detail, description, etc.,

so that their work is definitely more complete. Third, it may be that assessors equate "amount" with "quality", unconsciously counting words and sentences.

The PTAS was not influenced by the amount written. Some prolific writers scored favorably using the PTAS and others did not.

Systematic vs. Unsystematic Grading

Since the experimenter has experienced both systematic and unsystematic grading, it is possible to compare the two. One of the first comparisons that can be made is that work which had unsystematically been evaluated as "excellent" was also assessed as clearly favorable (in all domains) when using each systematic assessment strategy. A second comparison is that systematic grading procedures may help prevent instructor biasness.

Training of Raters

With all approaches the researcher gained more insight as more diaries were rated. While this is to be expected, it indicates that raters need to be thoroughly trained. Spandel & Stiggins argue similarly for the evaluation of written composition. [34]

Limitations of Study

There are two possible limitations of this study: (1) the problem of generalizing the results to other types of journals and (2) the order in which the assessment strategies were applied.

Pedagogical Implications

In conclusion, it is felt that the Primary Trait Assessment Strategy is useful for assessing self-disclosure but it is not recommended as an overall assessment strategy for communication journals. While the Holistic approach may produce a general picture, it is not recommended for inexperienced journal raters.

The Analytic Assessment Strategy was the superior of the three strategies used to determine a student's mastery of Speech Communication in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains. If self-disclosure were added, it would prove to be a most effective assessment guide.

After completion of this study, the researcher added self-disclosure to the Analytic Assessment Strategy and used it as a guide to grade diaries for an academic year. (See Appendix F). While no systematic conclusions have been reached, the general overall conclusion is that it is a most efficient method that would be highly recommended as an assessment tool for student interpersonal journals.

NOTES

[1]Elizabeth A. Daly. Using Student Journals to Individualize Instruction (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED151 014, November, 1977), p.3.

[2]Sue DeWine. Student Journals in the Communication Classroom: A Content Analysis (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED147 91, December, 1977), p.4.

[3]Geoffrey Sainty, "The Diary as an Aid to the Counselor." School Counselor 19 (March 1972): 293-296.

[4]Michael Baron. Journal Keeping, Self-Evaluation, and Self-Actualization (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 170 642, September, 1978).

[5]Toby E. Fulwiler. Journal Writing Across the Curriculum (N.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 161 073, April, 1978).

[6]Lynn Phelps and Sue DeWine, Instructor's Manual -- Interpersonal Communication Journal (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1976), p. viii.

[7]Richard L. Weaver, II, "The Use of Exercises and Games." Speech Teacher 23 (November 1974): 302-311.

[8]John Keltner. Instructor's Manual -- Interpersonal Speech Communication -- Elements and Structures (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1970), p.22.

[9]Ibid., p.23.

[10]Michael R. Moore, Instructor's Manual to accompany Introduction to Human Communication by James C. McCrosbey and Lawrence R. Wheelers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), p.108.

[11]Robert M. Esch. "Writing as a Literary Activity: The Journal in the Sophomore Survey Course." Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition, St. Louis, March, 1975.

[12]Elizabeth A. Daly. Using Student Journals to Individualize Instruction (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 014, November 1977).

[13]Ibid., p. 7.

[14]Jane Szutu Permaul and Marina Buhler Miko. Documentation and Evaluation of Sponsored Experimental Learning (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 148 858, January, 1977).

[15]Ibid.

[16]Sue DeWine, "The Communication Journal: A New Tool for Building Interpersonal Relationships in the Communication Classroom." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Indiana, April, 1976, p. 13.

[17]Lynn Phelps and Sue DeWine, Instructor's Manual -- Interpersonal Communication Journal (New York: West Publishing Co., 1976), p. viii.

[18]Sue DeWine. Student Journals in the Communication Classroom: A Content Analysis (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 14791, December, 1977).

[19]Elizabeth A. Daly. Using Student Journals to Individualize Instruction (U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 014, November, 1977).

[20]Sue DeWine, 1977, p. 2.

[21]Severyn T. Bruyn, The Human Perspective in Sociology -- The Methodology of Participant Observation (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), pp. 89-90.

[22]Robert Bogdan and Steven J. Taylor, Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975), p. 4.

[23]Bruyn, p. 277.

[24]Bogdan and Taylor, p. 4.

[25]Vicki Spandel and Richard J. Stiggins, Direct Measures of Writing Skills: Issues and Applications (Oregon: Clearinghouse for Applied Performance Testing, 1980), pp. 19-27.

[26]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[27]Keltner, p. 25.

[28]Moore, p. 108.

[29]Spandel and Stiggins, p. 23.

[30]Lawrence R. Wheeless and Janis Grotz, "Conceptualization and Measurement of Reported Self-Disclosure," Human Communication Research 2 (Summer 1976): 338.

[31]Barnett W. Pearch and Stewart M. Sharp, "Self-Disclosing Communication," The Journal of Communication 23 (December 1973): 409.

[32]John W. Keltner, Interpersonal Speech Communication -- Elements and Structures (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1970), p. 56.

[33]Charles R. Berger and others. "Perceptions of Information Sequencing in Relationship Development," Human Communication Research 3 (Fall 1976): 29.

[34]Spandel & Stiggins, pp. 19-20.

APPENDIX A

REPORT ON JOURNAL ENTRIES

Keltner (1970)

1. Completeness:

___ Descriptive account missing
___ Personal reactions missing or adequate
___ Evaluation missing
___ Entries have too limited information
___ Entries lack thoroughness
___ Fairly complete
___ Complete and thorough

2. Depth of Entries:

___ Superficial and sketchy
___ Shows only limited insight
___ Shows some insight
___ Shows good insight
___ Shows excellent insight

3. Form:

___ Poor; ___ Fair; ___ Adequate; ___ Good; ___ Excellent

4. Particular needs to resolve:

___ Provide regular dated entries
___ Provide lists of those attending
___ Provide clearer exposition of events
___ Include evaluation of each session
___ Clearer distinction between what happened and your feelings
___ More depth of analysis and description
___ Clearer and more thorough exposition of your feelings and personal reactions

Comments:

Student: _____

APPENDIX B

JOURNAL CHECKLIST

Moore, for McCroskey and Wheeless (1976)

Student: _____

1. Completeness of Descriptions:

___ Most entries too general, need to be more specific
___ Many entries adequate, but others too general
___ Most entries adequate
___ Most entries very complete

2. Depth of Entries:

___ Most very superficial
___ Some insight shown, however, limited
___ Most show good insight
___ Most show excellent insight

3. Indication of Ability to Apply Communication Principles and Concepts:

___ Very limited ability
___ Average ability
___ High degree of ability
___ Excellent ability

4. Specific Areas in Which Work is Needed:

___ Provide dated entries more frequently
___ Provide more complete descriptions
___ Provide greater depth and analysis
___ Provide clearer distinction between objective descriptions, personal evaluation and objective evaluation
___ Attempt to apply communication principles and concepts more frequently

Comments:

APPENDIX C (see attached)

STRATEGY I ONE ASSESSMENT GUIDE

Packet Number

	Diary 1	Diary 2	Diary 3	Diary 4	Diary 5	Diary 6	Diary 7	Diary 8	Diary 9	Diary 10	Diary 11	Diary 12
Part I												
1. Completeness of Descriptions:												
Most entries are too general, need to be more specific												
Most entries adequate, but others too general												
Most entries adequate												
Most entries very complete												
2. Depth of Entries:												
Superficial and sketchy												
Shows only limited insight												
Shows some insight												
Shows good insight												
Shows excellent insight												
3. Ability to apply communication principles and concepts:												
Very limited ability												
Average ability												
High degree of ability												
Excellent ability												
4. Specific areas in which work is needed:												
Provide evaluation of experience more frequently												
Provide clearer exposition of events												
Provide clearer distinction between what happened and your feelings												
Provide answers for all questions												
Part II												
Cognitive Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												
Affective Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												
Behavioral Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												

APPENDIX C
(Categories retyped to improve readability)

Part I
1. Completeness of Descriptions:

Most entries are too general, need to be more specific
Most entries adequate, but others too general
Most entries adequate
Most entries very complete

2. Depth of Entries:

Superficial and sketchy
Shows only limited insight
Shows some insight
Shows good insight
Shows excellent insight

3. Ability to apply communication principles and concepts:

Very limited ability
Average ability
High degree of ability
Excellent ability

4. Specific areas in which work is needed:

Provide evaluation of experience more frequently
Provide clearer exposition of events
Provide clearer distinction between what happened and your feelings
Provide answers for all questions

Part II
Cognitive Component

clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between

Affective Component

clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between

Behavioral Component

clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between

APPENDIX D

Strategy # Two Assessment Guide Packet Number ____

* Retyped to increase readability

Part I Self-Disclosure check-list:	Diary 1	Diary 2	Diary 3	Diary 4	Diary 5	Diary 6	Diary 7	Diary 8	Diary 9	Diary 10	Diary 11	Diary 12
demographic and biographic												
attitudes and opinions												
tastes and interests												
life perceptions												
personality choices												
physical likes and dislikes												
loves and mates												
fears and anxieties												
reactions to experiences												
perceptions of others												
self-perceptions												
other												
Part II Cognitive Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												
Affective Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												
Behavioral Component												
clearly favorable												
clearly unfavorable												
somewhere in between												

Part III

COMMENTS:

* Part I

demographic and biographic
attitudes and opinions
tastes and interests
life perceptions
personality choices
physical likes and dislikes
loves and mates
fears and anxieties
reactions to experiences
perceptions of others
self-perceptions
other

* Part II

Cognitive Component
clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between
Affective Component
clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between
Behavioral Component
clearly favorable
clearly unfavorable
somewhere in between

APPENDIX E

Strategy 3 Three Assessment Guide Packet Number_____

	Diary 1	Diary 2	Diary 3	Diary 4	Diary 5	Diary 6	Diary 7	Diary 8	Diary 9	Diary 10	Diary 11	Diary 12	
Part One:													
Holistic Approach:													
Cognitive Component													
clearly favorable													
clearly unfavorable													
somewhere in between													
Affective Component													
clearly favorable													
clearly unfavorable													
somewhere in between													
Behavioral Component													
clearly favorable													
clearly unfavorable													
somewhere in between													

Part Two:
COMMENTS:

SPEECH COMMUNICATION JOURNAL ASSESSMENT GUIDE

APPENDIX F

Name & Section _____

Lab # _____

PART I	Diary 1	Diary 2	Diary 3	Diary 4	Diary 5	Diary 6	Diary 7	Diary 8	Diary 9	Diary 10	Diary 11	Diary 12
1. Completeness of Descriptions:												
Most entries are too general, need to be more specific												
Most entries adequate, but others too general												
Most entries adequate												
Most entries very complete												
2. Depth of Entries:												
Superficial and sketchy												
Shows only limited insight												
Shows some insight												
Shows good insight												
Shows excellent insight												
3. Ability to apply communication principles and concepts:												
very limited ability												
Average ability												
High degree of ability												
Excellent ability												
4. Self-Disclosure Check List:												
Fears and anxieties												
Reactions to experiences												
Perceptions of others												
Self-perception												
5. Specific areas in which work is needed:												
Provide evaluation of experience more frequently												
Provide clearer exposition of events												
Provide clearer distinction between what happened and your feelings												
Provide answers for all questions												
Provide more self-disclosure												
PART II												
1. Cognitive Component:												
Clearly favorable												
Somewhere in between												
Clearly unfavorable												
2. Affective Component:												
Clearly favorable												
Somewhere in between												
Clearly unfavorable												
3. Behavioral Component												
Clearly favorable												
Somewhere in between												
Clearly unfavorable												